

So let's work for a practical solution that will help our farm families and rural communities this fall. Let's take the caps off of loan rates. Let's have at least a 1-year provision for a Farmer Owned Reserve to give the farmer the opportunity to market when prices are high. We must act soon. It is our responsibility. I think it would be a dereliction of our duty to leave here in October without passing legislation to address the deepening farm income crisis in our Nation. I hope and expect sometime within the next several days, perhaps next week, Senator DASCHLE and I and others, hopefully in a bipartisan manner, will again be offering an amendment to lift the loan rate caps, to get the loan rates up, the marketing loan basis for these farmers this fall.

I am hopeful that our colleagues will really take a serious look at this, because we are facing a farm crisis in America unlike any we have seen in a long, long time, and we have to act and we have to act now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). The Senator from Arizona.

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

##### AMENDMENT NO. 3500, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment, and the modification is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator's amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as further modified, is as follows:

On page 33, line 4, before the colon insert the following: “; and (4) North Korea is not actively pursuing the acquisition or development of a nuclear capability (other than the light-water reactors provided for by the 1994 Agreed Framework Between the United States and North Korea).”

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the modification, by the way, takes out the provision, at the request of the administration and others, that requires that the North Koreans be fully meeting their obligations under the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. I did that with some reluctance, but, at the same time, the important aspect of this amendment is that the President must certify that North Korea is not actively pursuing the acquisition or development of nuclear capability, other than light-water reactors provided for in the 1994 Agreed Framework between the United States and North Korea.

I think it is the desire of the distinguished manager that we vote on this amendment. First of all, I ask, if it has not taken place, that the Hutchison second-degree amendment be voice voted at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Hutchison amendment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. If the Senator from Arizona will withhold for just a moment.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I will make some additional remarks which are so compelling, and as soon as the Senator from Kentucky desires, I will yield so that we can proceed with this vote. I know the Senator from Kentucky is very interested in concluding this legislation, as are the rest of us. Given the conditions in the world today, I argue this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that we will consider in the Senate.

Yesterday there was an article in the New York Times, parts of which I think are important to note.

It is titled “Missile Test By North Korea: Dark Omen for Washington.” Part of the article says:

The officials and arms experts said the test also suggested that North Korea had made real progress towards building Taepodong-2, which is reportedly capable of traveling 2,400 to 3,600 miles and could strike targets throughout Asia and as far away as Alaska.

Henry D. Sokolski, the executive director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center in Washington, said the ability to build rockets in stages opened the door to intercontinental missiles, which in theory have virtually unlimited range.

“We're entering a new era,” Mr. Sokolski said.

Gary Milhollin, director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control, another research organization in Washington, said the missile test was “a clear sign” of North Korea's intent to develop nuclear weapons, despite its 1994 agreement with the United States to stop in exchange for energy assistance.

Mr. Milhollin said a two-stage missile was too costly to build simply for delivering conventional weapons. “It means they plan to put a nuclear warhead on it or export it to somebody who will,” he said. “The missile makes no sense otherwise.”

Mr. President, these are important statements. Some argue that perhaps the North Koreans are just simply building a missile and they are not pursuing the acquisition of nuclear weapons.

As Mr. Milhollin said, it doesn't make sense. Why else would they be building a two-stage rocket without planning also to have that missile armed with a weapon of mass destruction?—from what we have seen in the past, most likely a nuclear weapon.

I don't want to go through the litany of my complaints about this agreement that was made with North Korea in 1994. I spoke at length on the floor of the Senate and with the media. I did not see any indication that the North Koreans were serious. I did see indications they were in violation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty to which they were signatories and that we were basically providing them with a bribe. I also believed and still believe that unless the North Koreans understand they have to pay a significant price, then they will continue in this most destabilizing activity.

The Florida Times Union on August 28 said:

An argument could be made that Pyongyang feels it must renew its nuclear

program to keep people warm, but it also claims it cannot feed its people and has been begging successfully for free rice. If it doesn't have enough money to feed its people, how can it have enough money to build expensive nuclear facilities and two-stage rockets? Pyongyang presumably is taking money that would have been spent on food and heat if not for western charity in building a nuclear arsenal.

Unfortunately, the administration made it easy for Pyongyang to cheat. The agreement does not require inspections to verify North Korean compliance. Oddly enough, Pyongyang threatened earlier this month to pull out of the agreement over the U.S. failure to lift economic sanctions quickly enough. It has also complained about the lack of progress toward diplomatic ties. Those sound more like excuses to me for cheating on an agreement rather than reasons to break it. Not once since its inception in the aftermath of World War II has North Korea proven itself trustworthy. That makes it difficult for the United States to continue making agreements based purely on trust.

Mr. Hoagland, probably one of the most respected, if not the most respected, individual commentators on the issues of national security, said:

The U.S.-negotiated agreement that froze North Korea's nuclear weapons development in 1994 is coming apart.

With their economy in trouble, South Korea and Japan have been having second thoughts about the high levels of economic aid the deal mandates, and Congress has always been unhappy about the fuel oil shipments the administration agreed to make without congressional consultation. These concerns were undermining the accord even before the discovery this month that North Korea has been working on an underground secret facility that almost certainly violates the accord.

That discovery could be the nail in the coffin of the agreement, which pulled North Korea and the United States back from a military confrontation that could soon resume.

Mr. President, Mr. Charles Krauthammer, a man whom I have great respect for, also wrote on August 30:

Consider North Korea. In 1994, it broke the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and embarked on nuke building. How did Clinton react? By agreeing to supply North Korea indefinitely with free oil while the United States and allies build for it two brand new (ostensibly safer) \$5 billion nuclear reactors in return for a promise to freeze its weapon program.

Now it turns out that while taking this gigantic bribe North Korea was building a huge new nuclear facility inside a mountain. The administration, inert and dismayed by such ungentle manliness, refuses to call this a violation of the agreement. Why? Because concrete has not been poured.

Today the Los Angeles Times editorial reads, “Time to Rethink North Korea Policy”:

If ever there was a time for Washington to reappraise its policy toward North Korea, it is now. In the midst of meetings between American and North Korean negotiators in New York, the Pyongyang regime fired a new, longer-range missile across the Sea of Japan and over the Japanese mainland. That provocative act constitutes a major setback in diplomatic efforts to draw hostile North Korea into the world community.

The missile was discussed at Monday's meeting in New York, which focused on implementation of a 1994 accord under which

the United States, South Korea, Japan and the European Union would help North Korea build two nuclear power reactors of no military use in exchange for a freeze on nuclear weapons development. U.S. representatives did not say Monday what, if any, explanation was given by Pyongyang. On Tuesday, North Korea declined to meet.

\* \* \* \* \*  
 U.S. officials, curiously, said they were not surprised by the test and had warned of it in advance. Military analysts pointed to the range capability that North Korea has now shown and said that chemical, biological and even nuclear warheads could be put on such a missile. The test came only a few weeks after U.S. intelligence satellites uncovered activity at a huge, supposedly shuttled nuclear facility.

Perhaps Pyongyang fired the missile as a ploy to get Washington to fully deliver on its pledge to provide 500,000 tons of fuel oil this year as part of the reactor deal. If so, the tactic has backfired. Members of Congress who had balked at paying for the fuel now are irate.

North Korea may have also been advertising its missile to other renegade nations. Military sales are one of the few money-making ventures left for the impoverished country, which has been warning that it may have to restart its nuclear weapons program. The episode smacks of blackmail, not diplomacy. All the more reason for the Clinton administration to reconsider its long, patient persuasion of Pyongyang.

Mr. President, on July 8, 1998, Secretary of State Albright said:

Regional security is another matter on which dialogue with Beijing has enhanced cooperation and fostered progress. For example, the People's Republic of China has consistently supported the Agreed Framework that has frozen North Korea's dangerous nuclear weapons program, and has urged the North to continue complying with it.

Secretary Albright said, on March 4, 1998:

Our request this year includes \$35 million for the Korean Energy Development Organization. The Agreed Framework has succeeded in freezing North Korea's dangerous nuclear program. Now it has begun that program one step at a time—having secured over 90% of the program's spent fuel, which represents several bombs' worth of weapons-grade plutonium after reprocessing.

Secretary Albright, on February 10, 1998:

We believe our FY99 budget request for \$35 million for KEDO is both necessary and justified to maintain U.S. leadership within KEDO, ensure that KEDO continues to fulfill its important mission, and secure continued DPRK compliance with its nonproliferation obligations under the U.S. DPRK Agreed Framework.

She said, on February 12, 1997:

Let me just say this is obviously a very complex subject, but I believe that the framework agreement is one of the best things that the administration has done because it stopped a nuclear weapons program in North Korea.

Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal on Friday, August 21, said North Korea's nukes—

In essence, what was signed in 1994 was an arms-control agreement that suffered from the central flaws common to all such efforts: Even when verification is possible—and in this case it was specifically excluded—there is no way to enforce compliance. More to the

point, there is no will to enforce it. So much effort and face and prestige goes into getting these deals signed that when something goes wrong, nobody wants to admit it.

\* \* \* \* \*

North Korea is different only because Pyongyang openly conducts foreign policy through blackmail. Earlier this year, it threatened to resume its nuclear weapons program and declared it would keep selling missiles to clients like Iran and Iraq unless the U.S. lifted economic sanctions. It also has demanded more fuel oil and more food for its hungry population. A group of U.S. Congressmen in North Korea for a whirlwind official famine tour this week came away convinced that millions are near starvation and hundreds of thousands of others have already died of hunger. As terrible as this is, it is all the more horrifying when you consider that the Stalinist regime is spending what little money it does have building long-range missiles that will be able to hit the United States, according to a commission appointed by the U.S. Congress. Or on that giant new underground complex where nuclear weapons production was "frozen" in 1994.

It may turn out that the complex is not a nuclear-weapons plant after all. Even so, the administration's timely retaliation in Afghanistan and the Sudan will have two beneficial effects. It will signal the North Koreans that America's patience is not unlimited, and that consequently they may wish to rethink their current strategy of trying to blackmail the U.S. into coughing up more aid by playing the nuclear card.

Mr. President, the fact is that no one understands North Korea. No one understands what goes on inside that Orwellian country. And it is impossible to predict what the thinking is that would cause them to have a delegation in New York supposedly in serious negotiations and at the same time launch this two-stage missile. I cannot imagine the reaction of the American people if a foreign country launched a missile one stage of which hit on one side of Florida and the other one hit on the other side of Florida.

Mr. President, I think the American people would be incredulous and greatly disturbed over such an event. Well, that is what the North Koreans just did vis-a-vis Japan, a country that had pledged to provide the bulk of several billion dollars worth of construction of a nuclear powerplant.

This is a serious situation. Obviously, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them is one of the greatest challenges we face in this post-cold war era. We have to bring this threat to a halt. I hope that the administration, as the Los Angeles Times recommends, rethinks the North Korean policy. In the meantime, we cannot continue to fund any program that would provide any encouragement as well as financial assistance to a country that clearly has time after time after time broken its word and has committed acts of provocation and aggression.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. But, Mr. President, before I do that, I want to say that I would like to move this amendment as soon as possible, and hope that we can do so. I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield, I have an amendment I would like to offer. If my colleague from Arizona has completed his debate on this, I would ask—

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I am told by staff here that they would prefer to wait until the manager of the bill comes to the floor before that permission be granted. So I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I defer to the managers to make a proper motion to temporarily set aside the McCain amendment for the purposes of offering and debating at this point my amendment.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, we have an understanding with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that at whatever point the two democratic Senators who are requesting an opportunity to be heard on the McCain amendment arrive on the Senate floor, we can go back to the McCain amendment and dispose of that. With that understanding with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, I have no objection to temporarily laying aside the McCain amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. I inform my colleagues I know there are other Members who want to be heard on this amendment, and I certainly would not ask for a vote on this amendment until other Members have had a chance to be on it. Specifically, my colleague from Alabama, Senator SHELBY, and possibly others, will speak in opposition, I am told, to this amendment. I will not make an attempt to have the amendment disposed of until they have had an opportunity to be heard.

AMENDMENT NO. 3527

(Purpose: Establish a procedure for the declassification of information pertaining to Guatemala and Honduras)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], for himself, and Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KERREY, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 3527.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill add the following new section:

**SEC. . RESPONSIBILITY TO MAKE AVAILABLE HUMAN RIGHTS RECORDS PURSUANT TO PENDING REQUESTS.**

**(a) GUATEMALA AND HONDURAS.—**

(1) The United States has received specific written requests for human rights records from the Guatemala Clarification Commission and the National Human Rights Commissioner in Honduras, and from American citizens and their relatives who have been victims of gross violations of human rights in those countries.

(2) Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency shall review all requested human rights records referred to in subsection (a)(1) which it has not yet located or reviewed for the purpose of declassifying and disclosing such records to the public except as provided in subsection (b).

**(b) POSTPONEMENT OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—**

(1) **GROUND FOR POSTPONEMENT OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF HUMAN RIGHTS RECORDS.—**An agency may only postpone public disclosure of a human rights record or portions thereof that are responsive to the pending requests—

(A) pursuant to the declassification standards contained in section 6 of P.L. 102-526, or

(B)(i) if its public disclosure should be expected to reveal the identity of a confidential human source,

(ii) however it shall not be grounds for withholding from public disclosure relevant information about an individual's involvement in a human rights matter solely because that individual was or is an intelligence source, however, the public disclosure of the fact that the individual was or is such a source may be withheld pursuant to this section.

(2) **REVIEW OF DECISION TO WITHHOLD RECORDS.—**The Interagency Security Classification Appeals Panel (hereinafter in this section the "Panel"), established under Executive Order No. 12958, shall—

(A) review all decisions to withhold the public disclosure of any human rights record that has been identified pursuant to requests referred to in subsection (a)(1), subject to the declassification standards referred to in subsection (b)(1);

(B) notify the head of the agency in control or possession of the human rights record that was the subject of the review of its determination and publish such determination in the Federal Register;

(C) contemporaneously notify the President of its determination, who shall have the sole and nondelegable authority to review any determination of the Panel, and whose review shall be based on the declassification standards referred to in subsection (b)(1). Within 30 calendar days of notification, the President shall provide the Panel with an unclassified certification setting forth his decision and the reasons therefor; and

(D) publish in the Federal Register a copy of any unclassified written certification, statement, and any other materials that the President deems appropriate in each instance.

(3) **REFERENCES.—**For purposes of this section, references in sections 6 and 9 of P.L. 102-526 to "assassination records" shall be deemed to be references to "human rights records".

(c) **CREATION OF POSITIONS.—**(1) For purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section, there shall be two additional positions on the Panel. The President shall appoint individuals, not currently employees of the United States Government, who have substantial human rights expertise and who are able to meet the requisite security clearance requirements for these positions.

(2) The rights and obligations of such individuals on the Panel shall be limited to matters relating to the review of human rights records and their service on the panel shall end upon completion of that review.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.—**In this Section:

(1) **HUMAN RIGHTS RECORD.—**The term "human rights record" means a record in the possession, custody, or control of the United States Government containing information about gross violations of internationally recognized human rights committed in Honduras and Guatemala.

(2) **AGENCY.—**The term "agency" means any agency of the United States Government charged with the conduct of foreign policy or foreign intelligence, including the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, the Department of Justice, the National Security Council, and the Executive Office of the President.

(3) **GROSS VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HUMAN RIGHTS.—**The term "gross violations of internationally recognized human rights" has the same meaning as is contained in section 502(B)(d)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have brief remarks about this amendment. It is focused on two countries, Guatemala and Honduras. It is not worldwide. It is designed to try to have documents declassified, dating back to a decade ago. Many people recall the tragedies of the conflict in Central America. It actually goes back more than two decades. In the case of Guatemala, it goes back 30 or 40 years.

Civil wars have now been concluded. There are democratically led governments moving in a direction to try to address their underlying economic and social needs. The conflict that plagued these countries and ourselves cost the lives of thousands of people, as well as thousands more who were injured and brutalized in those conflicts.

We are seeking with this amendment to declassify certain information that might allow us, in the case particularly of an American citizen who was brutalized in that conflict almost a decade ago, to gather necessary information so that those who perpetrated the crimes against her could be brought to the bar of justice.

The Clinton administration has already agreed in principle to assist the Guatemalan and Honduran authorities investigating past human rights abuses that occurred during this period. These investigations are critical to these societies being able to complete the process of reconciliation and establish a credible foundation on which to build democratic institutions which truly reflect the rule of law and to put an end to impunity.

While some U.S. agencies have already responded very fully and positively to these requests, others appear to have done little or nothing meaningful to review and turn over materials that could be critical to the success of this exercise. The slowness of certain agencies in the production of materials, in some cases which are totally nonresponsive to these requests, have caused a level of cynicism about the commitment of some agencies to fully support this effort.

I know my colleagues, Senator LEAHY and Senator MCCONNELL, are

very familiar with the case of the American citizen, Sister Diana Ortiz, who was abducted and brutally raped and tortured while serving in a rural community in Guatemala in 1989. Not surprisingly, Sister Ortiz's life has never been the same. Her efforts to shed light on the details of the crimes against her have been met with indifference, at best. As is too often the case in rape cases, she believes that rather than being viewed as the victim, she has been treated by certain government officials as a perpetrator of some crime or involved in nefarious behavior. I don't think the 101 cigarette burns on her back would indicate necessarily at all that someone was the perpetrator rather than the victim.

Just today, I received a very moving letter from Sister Ortiz. Attached to her letter was a statement that she recently gave laying out some of the new information about her case. Let me quote from her letter, because I think it helps explain why I am offering this amendment today. Sister Ortiz writes:

Despite my efforts, I still don't know the truth of why I was abducted and tortured. It is true that government agencies have released documents to me. They consist of such public items as articles written by the press, human rights reports from the U.S. Embassy in Guatemala, documents relating to cases other than my own, and letters written to Members of Congress. I have also received blank sheets of white paper.

Mr. President, this is not just some isolated document. This is basically what a lot of the released documents look like here. This is declassified human rights documents, blank pages: "Honduran armed services human rights and corruption." A blank page.

Here is another example of the declassified documents released on her case:

A U.S. ally has received U.S. Embassy and Honduran government support.

It goes on. That has little or nothing to do with the situation involving Sister Ortiz. The rest is blank.

This is one of the released documents:

Press reports of January 1988 indicate that the 316 battalion was deactivated in September 1987 to quell speculation following allegations of death squad activities made against the battalion.

The rest is blank, as if this were some highly pertinent document. This is obviously not readable here at all. For the purpose of demonstrating to my colleagues, here is what we are talking about. I could go through this quickly. These are all blank pages. I am not filling these in. These are sheets of blank pages that come up on this report.

Now, obviously, there are legitimate concerns that intelligence agencies can have about just releasing any and all documents that people would like to have access to. You can't tolerate that, even in a case as moving as that of Sister Ortiz.

This amendment says that within 120 days of enactment of the underlying bill it would search the documents for

relevant material in Honduras and Guatemala if documents are discovered and found, and the agencies, for whatever reasons—there are a list of reasons—adopted in law where methods and sources could be revealed and other important information that could be harmful to U.S. interests. Then there is a panel made up of representatives from the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Archivist of the United States and the Justice Department, which would review that request from the agency objecting to the release of certain documents. So there is a system whereby they would review whether or not, in fact, the decision not to release information was worthwhile.

So there is a process in place here. It is not worldwide. It is, in fact, situations surrounding these two countries. It involves an American citizen who was brutally tortured and would like to get to the bottom of what happened to her—an American nun working in Honduras and in Guatemala doing work that she and others felt made a significant contribution to the well-being of people there. She would like to find out why it happened. It is not asking too much, in the case of these two countries, for the declassification of documents which could help her pursue this case, again, allowing for a very legitimate process to be in place so that there is not the unintentional release of documents that could in some way compromise the interests of the United States.

That is the sum and substance of this amendment, Mr. President. I hope that our colleagues will see fit to be supportive of it. It doesn't go too far, in my view. As I said, it is limited in scope, in terms of the countries involved, and also there is a process in place in this amendment that would allow for the information, in cases where it should not be released, to be withheld.

I also point out, Mr. President, that I am particularly grateful to my colleagues, Senators LEAHY, MIKULSKI, KERRY of Massachusetts and KERREY of Nebraska, the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, who is a cosponsor of this amendment, along with Senator HARKIN and several others who have joined with me in this effort.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter from Sister Ortiz, as well as the very moving testimony that she gave on June 25, 1998, be printed in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 2, 1998.

Senator CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,  
*U.S. Senate,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR DODD: I cannot begin to thank you enough for being in the forefront of the struggle for the Human Rights Information Act. Thousands upon thousands of Guatemalans and Hondurans await the outcome of Senate action on this legislation

which is of so much importance to them. It is, of course, of great importance to me as well.

It may seem to many in Congress that my search for justice is never-ending. This is hardly surprising for it is exactly how it has felt to me during these past nine long years. Despite my best efforts, I still don't know the truth of why I was abducted and tortured nor have I obtained any information on the identity of "Alejandro." It is true that various government agencies have released documents to me. Now, let me tell you a little about them. They consist of such (public) items as articles written by the press, human rights reports from the U.S. Embassy in Guatemala, documents relating to cases other than my own, and letters written to members of Congress. I have also received black white sheets, and a few messages from former Ambassador Thomas Stroock—one written a week after I was abducted that stated: "Her story, as told is not accurate." Other cables from Stroock's office/State Department describe me as a political strategist, who had perhaps staged my own abduction to secure a cut-off of U.S. aid to the Guatemalan military. These are examples of "relevant documents" which have been released to me.

In the summer of 1996, the Justice Department conducted a criminal investigation. What I learned only during my participation was that I was to be the subject of the investigation and not those who abducted and tortured me. During my testimony before the House Human Rights Caucus on June 24th of this year, I spoke publicly of the treatment I received at the hands of DOJ officials. I am enclosing that testimony as both description of and further witness to how my case has, in fact, been investigated.

Now, on top of all this, I have been told by a legislative aide to another Senator that members of the Senate Intelligence Committee are saying that only 3 or 4 documents (pages) have been withheld from me. At this moment, a 284+ page Classified Report pertaining to my case remains in the hands of the Justice Department, which has been made available to the Intelligence Oversight Board, the former Ambassador to Guatemala, Thomas Stroock, and who knows how many others. But I, on the other hand, am denied access to it in order to protect my privacy and that of their sources, or so I am told (refer to June 24th Statement enclosed).

Again Senator Dodd, I thank you for your efforts on behalf of all who seek the truth. Like countless Guatemalans and Hondurans, this is all I seek. By calling on my government to declassify documents, I am simply pleading with it to allow us to heal. I want to put this nightmare behind me. I want to be able to have a good night's rest. I want peace—for myself and for the people of Guatemala and Honduras. And I don't think that is too much to ask.

In a spirit of gratitude,

DIANNA ORTIZ,  
*OSU.*

CONGRESSIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS CAUCUS  
BRIEFING ON TORTURE  
(By Sister Dianna Ortiz)

Thank you all for coming. As a survivor of torture, I want to urge you to support declassification of United States government documents that shed light on human rights abuses. Simply by declassifying documents, our government can save lives. Survivors of human rights violations need to know as much as possible about who committed the atrocities against them. With this information, justice is possible, and only justice can lay the foundation for reconciliation, stability, and peace. Guatemala and Honduras

are two countries that would benefit immeasurably from full declassification. The sticking point in these instances seems to be that the US has supported the abusers.

Take my case, for example. In 1989, while I was working as a missionary in Guatemala, I was abducted and brutally tortured by Guatemalan security agents. My back was burned over 100 times with cigarettes. I was gang-raped repeatedly. I was beaten, and I was tortured psychologically as well—I was lowered into a pit where injured women, children, and men writhed and moaned, and dead decayed, under swarms of rats. Finally, I was forced to stab another human being.

Throughout the ordeal, my Guatemalan torturers said that if I did not cooperate, they would have to communicate with Alejandro. My last minutes in detention, I met Alejandro, whom the torturers referred to as their boss. He was tall and fair skinned and spoke halting Spanish, with a thick American accent. His English was American, flawless, unaccented. When I asked him if he was an American, his answer was evasive: "Why do you want to know?"

He told me to get into his jeep and said he would take me to a friend of his at the United States embassy, who would help me leave the country. During the ride, he enjoined me to forgive my torturers and said if I didn't, there would be consequences for me. He reminded me that many torturers had made videotapes and taken photos of the parts of the torture I was most ashamed of. He said if I didn't forgive my torturers, he would have no choice but to release those photos and tapes to the press. At that point, I jumped out the jeep and ran.

For the last nine years, I have tried to stop running. I have tried to face the torturers head on and demand answers, demanded justice. Instead of "forgiving" my torturers, I filed suit against the Guatemalan government and called for an investigation. Like so many investigations in Guatemala, it led nowhere. Guatemalan and US officials alike said in public and in private that I was a lesbian who had never been tortured but had sneaked out for a tryst. The 111 cigarette burns on my back were the result of kinky sex.

Two years ago, I held a five-week vigil before the White House, asking for the declassification of all US government documents related to human rights abuses in Guatemala since 1954, including documents on my own case. I asked to know the identity of Alejandro. The Justice Department had begun an investigation August 1995, and the Intelligence Oversight Board had been investigating my case for more than a year, but I still had no answers. Finally, after weeks of fasting and camping day and night before the White House, a number of State Department documents were released to me. The following year, various FBI documents were declassified, but none of these documents contained anything about the identities of my torturers or of their boss, Alejandro.

Efforts to obtain information through US government investigations also led nowhere. The Department of Justice interviewed me for more than forty hours, during which time DOJ attorneys accused me of lying. They interrogated my friends and family members and generally made it clear that I was the culprit, I was the one being investigated, not the US government officials who might have acted wrongly in my case. Ultimately, the investigators seemed unable to comprehend the effects on a torture survivor of testifying in intricate detail for hours on end. Extremely dangerous and painful flashbacks were the consequence in my case. A torture survivor should never be asked to re-enter the torture chamber, to relive the brutal abuse. After I had given the great majority

of my testimony, I felt compelled to withdraw from direct participation in the DOJ investigation. The investigators had the sketches I had made with the help of a professional forensic artist, delineating the characteristics of each torturer, including Alejandro, and the investigators had my testimony, in detail. The responsibility for finding answers lay with them.

Because I could no longer subject myself to the retraumatization brought on by the investigators' questions and manner, the DOJ closed my case. Exactly what the DOJ's final conclusions were, I do not know. I do know that as a result of the investigation, the DOJ came up with a 200-page report, which is classified. The Department of Justice told me the report was classified to protect sources and methods and to protect my own privacy. Dan Seikely, who was in charge of the Department of Justice investigation, said only three people would be able to see the report: Attorney General Janet Reno, the deputy attorney general, and himself. Only four copies of the report existed, he said, and they would be kept under lock and key.

In recent months, however, it has become clear to me that a number of other people have read the report. A government official recently told me that he had seen the report and added that officials in the State Department also had seen it, as had Thomas Stroock, the US ambassador to Guatemala at the time I was abducted. I can't help but wonder how my government intends to protect my privacy by releasing the report to such individuals. It was under Stroock's command that an embassy staff member told a visiting religious delegation—"I'm tired of all these lesbian nuns coming down to Guatemala." It was Stroock who said, a week after I was abducted, before any embassy member had interviewed me, "Her story as told is not accurate." It was Stroock who told the State Department that my motives were questionable, that I had perhaps staged my own abduction to secure a cut-off of US aid to the Guatemalan army. Yet it is Stroock to whom the US government gives the report—a report so private that even I cannot see it. After he had read the DOJ report, Stroock spoke to a journalist, who in turn called me. Stroock was informing the press of his access to the report. In spite of his questionable right to see it, he was making no secret of the privileges he enjoyed. There are things in the report that I have kept secret, that I have been ashamed of—things that I didn't tell DOJ investigators but that my friends revealed as they were being interrogated—and I have lived under this tacit blackmail: If I push for more answers in my case, or if I even file a Freedom of Information Act request to get the DOJ report declassified, the secret information the investigators have will be leaked.

Instead of having that information leaked, let me simply tell you: I got pregnant as a result of the multiple gang rapes by my torturers, and unable to carry within me what they had engendered, what I could view only as a monster, the product of the men who had raped me, I turned to someone for assistance and I destroyed that life. Am I proud of this decision? No. But if I had to make the decision again, I believe I would again decide as I did eight years ago.

I had little choice. My survival was so precarious at that time that to have to grow within me what the torturers had left me would have killed me. I tell you this simply to free myself so that I can proceed to uncover the truth. Today, I am filing a FOIA to demand the DOJ report on my case. After such anguish that the DOJ interviews caused me, I have the right to know what was learned in my case, what conclusions were

reached and why. I demand access to the report, the same access that members of the State Department, Thomas Stroock, and members of the Intelligence Oversight Board have had, in spite of Seikely's guarantee of confidentiality.

I want to be able to evaluate the thoroughness of the investigation so that I can make informed decisions about what step to take next. My torturers were never brought to justice. It is possible that, individually, they will never be identified or apprehended. And in some senses, I would like to resign myself to this fact and move on. I have a responsibility, however, to the people of Guatemala and to the people of the world, a responsibility to insist on accountability where accountability is possible. If the US government was involved in my torture in Guatemala, in what other countries of the world are torturers receiving orders from Americans? We have to know what the United States has done and where. For our own peace of mind as US citizens and for the good of the citizens of the world, we need the files released. If the US has done nothing wrong, then we can all rest easy. If the US is culpable, we must know this and expose this and take steps to ensure that our government never again collaborates with or hires torturers, in any place, for any reason.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, again, at the request of the managers of the bill, at this point, I will yield the floor. I presume what will happen is that there are other Members who may show up to debate the McCain amendment, and then there would be a vote on that, and then there may be another amendment that would be disposed of. If I could be notified by my staff, or others, as to when the appropriate time to come back and engage in a further debate with those who have a differing point of view, I am happy to do that.

Mr. MCCONNELL. If my friend has completed his remarks, we will simply lay aside his amendment. Senator THOMAS is here to speak on the McCain amendment.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague from Kentucky very, very much for his courtesies in this, and my colleagues, as well, who have other amendments pending. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Dodd amendment be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3500, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise to address briefly the McCain amendment on S. 2334. I will talk a little bit about the situation in North Korea and the bill relating to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization, KEDO. I have been chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asia for almost 4 years, and we have held five hearings on North Korea during that time—more than any other single country, with the exception of China. In all of that time, I have continued to be amazed at and concerned by the dangerous, unpredictable and unbalanced nature of the regime in North Korea. Despite widespread starvation and dis-

ease, the Government continues to adhere to the very economic policies which have led to famine in the first place. Despite the worldwide reputation of communism, the Government continues to revolve around sort of a Stalinist cult of personality slavishly devoted to Kim Jong Il.

Despite international norms and conventions, the North Koreans continue to sell nuclear and conventional missile technology to such rogue states as Iraq and Libya in violation of the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty. Despite the terms of the Agreed Nuclear Framework with the United States, North Korea continues to develop its program aimed at producing nuclear missiles.

Mr. President, I have been sort of a begrudging supporter of the Agreed Framework since its inception. Although the agreement is far from perfect, I supported it because I believed that, in the end, it was in our best interest and in the best interest of the East Asia region to do so. I supported it through its fits and starts. I supported it when the North diverted oil deliveries to military use and when the North showed signs of restarting their nuclear program. I supported it because, on the whole, North Korean movement forward in the Four-Party Talks and cooperation in the nuclear area outweighed the North's traditional tendency to always push the envelope with us.

Mr. President, when North Korea fired off a missile last week over Japanese air space, it was kind of the straw that broke the camel's back. This is what I consider to be a clearly belligerent act and should drive home the fact to this body that the Agreed Framework has been gutted by North Korea. At present, it seems no better than the paper on which it was written. Time after time, the DPRK has broken its commitment under the agreement. While the North took our oil and dragged its heels, it has constructed underground facilities to test both propulsion and warhead systems with only one purpose: the development of long- and short-range nuclear weapon capabilities.

Frankly, I have a sinking feeling that they have used us, played us for a fool, and have played it very well. Mr. President, I intend to meet with the Defense Intelligence Agency this week, and to hold a hearing next week in our subcommittee to examine the present situation and to ask the State Department and Defense Department some tough questions.

If these questions can't be answered to our satisfaction, and if we can't be convinced that adherence to the Agreed Framework under the circumstances are in our best interests, then our support, I am sure, will evaporate very quickly.

I am pleased that we are considering it here. I am supportive of the McCain amendment. I look forward to having a chance to vote on it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. McCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona offered his amendment yesterday afternoon at 4 o'clock. We are trying to make progress on the bill.

I understand there is one person who desires to speak on the other side.

In fairness to everyone, with the concurrence of the Senator from Arizona, if we can't bring this to conclusion, I am going to make a motion to table the McCain amendment at 3 o'clock so that we can get an expression of opinion on the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I think we have some amendments that have been cleared on both sides which I will shortly send to the desk: a Brownback amendment on Iran; DeWine amendment on alternative crop development; three Craig amendments; a Reed-Reid amendment on scholarships; and a DeWine amendment on Haiti.

AMENDMENTS NUMBERED 3528 THROUGH 3534 EN BLOC

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send the amendments to the desk, and ask that they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] proposes amendments numbered 3528 through 3534, en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 3528 through 3534) are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3528

The Senate finds that:

According to the Department of State, Iran continues to support international terrorism, providing training, financing, and weapons to such terrorist groups as Hizballah, Islamic Jihad and Hamas;

Iran continues to oppose the Arab-Israeli peace process and refuses to recognize Israel's right to exist;

Iran continues aggressively to seek weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to deliver them;

It is long-standing U.S. policy to offer official government to government dialogue with the Iranian regime, such offers having been repeatedly rebuffed by Tehran;

More than a year after the election of President Khatemi, Iranian foreign policy continues to threaten American security and that of our allies in the Middle East;

Despite repeated offers and tentative steps toward rapprochement with Iran by the Clinton administration, including a decision to waive sanctions under the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act and the President's veto of the Iran Missile Proliferation Sanctions Act, Iran has failed to reciprocate in a meaningful manner.

Therefore it is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) the Administration should make no concessions to the government of Iran unless and until that government moderates its objectionable policies, including taking steps to end its support of international terrorism, opposition to the Middle East peace process, and the development and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery; and

(2) there should be no change in U.S. policy toward Iran until there is credible and sustained evidence of a change in Iranian policies.

AMENDMENT NO. 3529

(Purpose: To provide additional resources for enhanced alternative crop development support in source zone)

On page 10 line 19, insert "Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under the previous proviso not less than \$80,000,000 shall be made available for alternative development programs to drug production in Colombia, Peru and Bolivia.

AMENDMENT NO. 3530

(Purpose: To establish a Joint United States-Canada Commission on Cattle and Beef and dairy products to identify, and recommend means of resolving, national, regional, and provincial trade-distorting differences between the countries with respect to the production, processing, and sale of cattle, beef, and dairy products, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place, insert:

**SEC. . JOINT UNITED STATES-CANADA COMMISSION ON CATTLE AND BEEF.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Joint United States-Canada Commission on Cattle, Beef and Dairy Products to identify, and recommend means of resolving, national, regional, and provincial trade-distorting differences between the United States and Canada with respect to the production, processing, and sale of cattle, beef, and dairy products, with particular emphasis on—

- (1) animal health requirements;
- (2) transportation differences;
- (3) the availability of feed grains;
- (4) other market-distorting direct and indirect subsidies;
- (5) the expansion of the Northwest Pilot Project;
- (6) tariff rate quotas; and
- (7) other factors that distort trade between the United States and Canada.

(b) COMPOSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of—

- (A) 3 members representing the United States, including—
  - (i) 1 member appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate;
  - (ii) 1 member appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and
  - (iii) 1 member appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture;
- (B) 3 members representing Canada, appointed by the Government of Canada; and
- (C) nonvoting members appointed by the Commission to serve as advisers to the Commission, including university faculty, State veterinarians, trade experts, producers, and other members.

(2) APPOINTMENT.—Members of the Commission shall be appointed not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the first meeting of the Commission, the Commission shall submit a report to Congress and the Government of Canada that identifies, and recommends means of resolving, differences between the United States and Canada with respect to tariff rate quotas and the production, processing, and sale of cattle and beef, and dairy products.

AMENDMENT NO. 3531

(Purpose: To describe the circumstances under which funds made available under the legislation may be available to any tribunal)

On page 82, line 10, strike "Yugoslavia." and insert the following: "Yugoslavia: *Provided further*, That the drawdown made under

this section for any tribunal shall not be construed as an endorsement or precedent for the establishment of any standing or permanent international criminal tribunal or court: *Provided further*, That funds made available for the tribunal shall be made available subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT NO. 3532

(Purpose: To express the Sense of the Senate concerning the operation of agricultural commodity foreign assistance programs)

At the appropriate place, insert:

**SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE.**

(a) It is the Sense of the Senate that:

(1) The U.S. Department of Agriculture should use the GSM-102 credit guarantee program to provide 100 percent coverage, including shipping costs, in some markets where it may be temporarily necessary to encourage the export of U.S. wheat.

(2) The U.S. Department of Agriculture should increase the amount of GSM export credit available above the \$5.5 billion level (as it did in the 1991/1992 period). In addition to other nations, extra allocations should be made in the following amounts to:

- (A) Pakistan—an additional \$150 million;
- (B) Algeria—an additional \$140 million;
- (C) Bulgaria—an additional \$20 million; and
- (D) Romania—an additional \$20 million.

(3) The U.S. Department of Agriculture should use the PL-480 food assistance programs to the fullest extent possible, including the allocation of assistance to Indonesia and other Asian nations facing economic hardship.

(4) Given the President's reaffirmation of a Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam, the U.S. Department of Agriculture should consider Vietnam for GSM and PL-480 assistance.

AMENDMENT NO. 3533

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following: "That of the funds made available by prior Foreign Operations Appropriations Acts, not to exceed \$750,000 shall be made available for the Claiborne Pell Institute for International Relations and Public Policy at Salve Regina University."

AMENDMENT NO. 3534

(Purpose: to prohibit the availability of funds for Haiti unless certain conditions are met)

Beginning on page 90 line 1, after the word "the" insert "central".

On page 91, line 11, after the word "ratified" insert "or is implementing".

On page 91, strike lines 19 through 20, and insert "for the Haitian National Police, customs assistance, humanitarian assistance, and education programs."

On page 91, line 22, after the word "available" insert "to the Government of Haiti".

On page 92, line 5 strike everything after the word "council" through the "period" on line 7 and insert in lieu thereof "that is acceptable to a broad spectrum of political parties and civic groups."

On page 92, line 8, after the word "Parties" insert "and Grass Roots Civic Organizations."

On page 92, line 13 after the word "parties" insert "and for the development of grass roots civic organizations".

On page 92, insert new section (e):

"(e)(1) AVAILABILITY OF ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE.—Funds appropriated under this act for the Ministry of Justice shall only be provided if the President certifies to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations and the

Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that Haiti's Ministry of Justice:

(A) Has demonstrated a commitment to the professionalization of judicial personnel by consistently placing students graduated by the Judicial School in appropriate judicial positions and has made a commitment to share program costs associated with the Judicial School;

(B) Is making progress in making the judicial branch in Haiti independent from the executive branch, as outlined in the 1987 Constitution; and

(C) Has re-instituted judicial training with the Office of Prosecutorial Development and Training (OPDAT).

(2) The limitation in subsection (e)(1) shall not apply to the provision of funds to support the training of prosecutors, judicial mentoring, and case management.

On page 92, line 14, strike "(e)" and insert "(f)".

On page 93, strike section (f) and all that follows.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, this amendment reflects a significant change in course on how we administer U.S. assistance in Haiti. From a practical standpoint, the amendment will not decrease our total commitment to the people of Haiti. However, it does place very clear restrictions on assistance to the Haitian government.

To best understand the reasons for this amendment—and why we have chosen to place more conditions on direct aid to the government of Haiti—it is important to first talk about the current situation in Haiti.

Mr. President, I have visited Haiti six times in the past three years. I have taken a great interest in assisting the people of Haiti as they establish, develop and sustain democracy, economic stability and a better quality of life. Through these visits, I have had the opportunity to see what changes have taken place and the general direction of events in Haiti.

My colleagues may recall that on April 3, 1998, I provided the Senate an update on the current economic, and political state of Haiti. At that time, I stated that Haiti's political system was not stable. Little has changed for the better since then. This continued instability is of direct concern to the United States. The concern of course is that this unstable democracy could descend into outright chaos. If this occurs, the result could be an exodus of boat people coming to our shores.

Mr. President, let me mention a few key facts to describe the current situation there.

First, it has been over 14 months since then Haitian Prime Minister Rosny Smarth resigned due to his frustration with the government's inability to resolve an electoral dispute and implement his economic modernization plan. Since then, a Prime Minister has not been confirmed by the Parliament.

The Prime Minister is designated as the Chief Executive of the Government. He appoints the Cabinet and basically runs the government. Without a Prime Minister, the country simply cannot function. Bills that may be passed by the Haitian Parliament cannot be

signed into law and the privatization of any government industries cannot be fully implemented.

It is truly unfortunate, that to date, this vacancy has not been filled. The current Education Minister has been nominated for the position. It is, however, unclear if he will be confirmed by the Haitian Senate. One of the main reasons for this continued delay stems from the Haitian government's inability to resolve the serious discrepancy surrounding the April 1997 elections.

This current political impasse stems from pervasive fraud and improper vote tabulation regarding elections held in April of 1997. Not only have the Haitian opposition political parties demanded that the April 1997 elections be annulled, the international community, including the United Nations, has also deemed the elections—which produced only a meager five percent turnout—fraudulent. The opposition political parties continue to insist that they will not move forward to confirm a Prime Minister until the April 1997 electoral dispute is resolved.

This paralysis in government is being felt everywhere: economic reform efforts have stalled. The legislature still has not passed a budget. It has not enacted structural reforms needed to free up over \$100 million in foreign assistance, nor has it approved loans for millions in technical assistance. The process of privatizing key government industries is dramatically slow, as are plans to downsize the public sector. With progress impeded by a political stalemate it is no surprise that potential investors who could play a key role in uplifting Haiti's economic development are discouraged from going forward.

Complicating matters even more was an upcoming national/municipal election in Haiti slated for November 1998. Hundreds of seats were up, including the entire lower chamber of the Haitian Parliament, up to two-thirds of the Senate and all municipal seats. Since there continues to be no resolution to the irregularities surrounding the previous election, however, the elections that constitutionally should be held in November have not been scheduled nor is there reason to believe that they will occur any earlier than next spring. All of this raises even more questions and concerns on Haiti's ability to administer future elections, including the presidential elections scheduled for the year 2000.

Democracy literally is at a standstill in Haiti. And it will remain stagnant until previous electoral disputes are resolved, and a credible, nonpartisan, competent electoral commission to oversee elections is established.

The composition of the electoral commission is the key source of controversy. A number of opposition parties in Haiti would like to have some representation on the commission, or at least make sure that the commission is neutral and not biased.

Mr. President, I understand that Haitian President Preval recently said he

will move forward with naming a provisional electoral council. There is concern that he intends not to consult with all opposition parties—meaning that the interests of other political parties will likely be excluded. This step would not seem to be an effective way to resolve the current political impasse.

When I spoke about Haiti last April, I urged that no U.S. assistance be used to underwrite the proposed November elections until a settlement of the April 1997 electoral dispute is reached—and until a fair and independent Electoral Council is established in accordance with the constitution. I am pleased that these conditions on funding are currently in the pending Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill, as well as in the House version.

Even if the electoral disputes are resolved and an electoral commission appointed, democracy cannot be sustained as long as lethal violence is seen as an effective tool to achieve political goals. To date, not one single case of the dozens of political killings that have occurred in Haiti since the early 1990's have been resolved. As a result, no one has been convicted and sentenced for any one of these crimes.

Mr. President, according to a House International Relations Committee staff report released just last week, fears of a new wave of political killings are on the rise following the recent murder of a Catholic priest who was a vocal critic of the current government, as well as of former President Aristide. The report also states that "A key opposition leader expressed concern that three other political figures may be targeted for assassination."

Not only have opposition political leaders been allegedly threatened, Haitians working for democratic institutions such as the International Republican Institute have also been targeted for intimidation and threats on their lives. One Haitian IRI employee was even held at gunpoint for his involvement in democratic activities in Haiti.

Mr. President, I also am concerned about new reports of drug corruption within the Haitian government. Specifically, there have been numerous reports in Haitian newspapers that Haitian National Police employees were arrested for involvement in drug trafficking. Haiti has become increasingly attractive as a transit point for international drug traffickers. Unless we address this situation soon, Haiti could turn into a full-fledged narco-state. And that means more and more illegal drugs coming through Haiti to the United States.

Mr. President, I have given you a brief outline and assessment of the current political situation in Haiti.

It has been the policy of this Congress for three years that until the Haitian government is able to meet specific economic, political and social reforms, our assistance to that government should be extremely limited. The money, instead should go to benefit Haitians directly.

That was the fundamental purpose of an amendment originally offered by our former Majority Leader, Bob Dole in 1995. Under the original Dole amendment, benchmarks for reform had to be met if assistance was to be provided. If these conditions were not met, government assistance would be transferred to non-governmental organizations, of NGOs. In the end, the President called for and received from Congress the power to waive these conditions and allow aid to go forward if he believed restricting aid to the Haitian government posed a national security concern to the United States. Congress included this national security waiver with the hope that things would improve in Haiti. Each year for the past three years, we have renewed the Dole amendment with some marginal modifications. Each year, the President has exercised his waiver authority to keep U.S. aid flowing to the Haitian government. And each year we hope the Haitian government will finally get its act together.

Well, Mr. President, three years have gone by. And the situation remains bleak. Based on a review of that situation, I now believe that it is necessary to go back to the original Dole proposal by removing the national security waiver. We have tried—patiently—for three years to work with the Haitian government to establish and sustain democracy there. Yet, I find it extremely difficult to invest in a government that is not willing to make changes to advance democracy and its economic health. We have spent well over \$2 billion in the past four years in Haiti.

We should continue to fund programs through NGOs that will benefit Haitians. But giving the government money for programs if they are not willing to implement needed political and economic reforms is wasted money.

Mr. President, let me turn now to an explanation of my amendment to the this bill. Let me first make it clear that this amendment does not prohibit assistance to Haiti. Just like current law, this amendment conditions our assistance to the Government of Haiti—but not the Haitian people. That means that any funds distributed to Haiti through NGOs for the benefit of Haitians will not be threatened nor compromised in any manner.

Let me first outline the important general conditions that the Haitian government must meet before we believe it receives any additional funding from the US government. These conditions are outlined—almost verbatim—in the pending Senate and House Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

These general conditions include:

First, the Haitian government must re-sign the Agreement on Migration Interdiction and Operations with the United States and must cooperate with the US in halting illegal emigration from Haiti. It has been nearly four years since this agreement expired and the US government has been waiting for Haiti to resign this agreement.

The second condition is that the Haitian government must conduct thorough investigations of extrajudicial and political killings and that it must cooperate with US authorities in these investigations. There have been dozens of political murders in Haiti over the past several years. Not a single one has been solved. That has got to change.

Third, the Haitian government must take action to remove from the Haitian National Police, and other national palace and ministerial guards, individuals who are credibly alleged to have engaged in or conspired to conceal gross violations of human rights or to have engaged in narcotics trafficking.

Fourth, that the Haitian government must complete privatization of at least three major public entities. The Haitian government is now years behind its own drafted scheduled in privatizing several key public entities.

The final condition is that the Haitian government must implement the counter-narcotics agreements recently signed between both countries last October. There are a total of six counter-narcotics agreements including the Ship Rider and Maritime Pursuit Agreements which allow US law enforcement to patrol Haitian waters for drug interdiction matters. These agreements basically allow for instantaneous implementation of drug enforcement activities between the two countries.

These are very important and reasonable conditions that must be met before the US government releases any general assistance directly to the government of Haiti. Many of them are not new.

Let me now address a more controversial question—whether the Administration can waive these conditions for national security reasons, and allow funding to go forward. For the past three years, the Administration has exercised its waiver authority to allow funding to go to the government. The pending bill before us continues this waiver; the pending House bill does not. My amendment would adopt the House version on this point. We must send a message to the government of Haiti that we cannot continue to give them money if they lack political will to make necessary reforms.

Mr. President, while my amendment would remove the national security interest waiver; there are several important exceptions to this amendment as well as in the pending bill that would enable the US government to continue funding certain important government programs. Taken together, these exceptions include—counter-narcotics assistance; support for the Haitian National Police's Special Investigative Unit; the International Criminal Investigative Training Assistance Program; customs assistance; anti-corruption programs; urgent humanitarian assistance; and education. There is also a separate provision on conditioning electoral and administration of justice assistance to the government of Haiti under a separate set of conditions.

One additional point I want to make is while I have included several additional exceptions to the Limitation of Assistance provision to the government of Haiti—I intend to explore during the conference of this bill the possible need to limit the total amount of money the Haitian government can receive if conditions set for in this amendment are not met while assistance to the government in these areas continues to flow.

Mr. President, before I conclude, I would like to mention two essential assistance programs that we provide to Haiti through NGO's.

First and foremost, US assistance through P.L. 480 Title II feeding programs to the poor is absolutely critical and should be continued. There are impoverished people in Haiti—particularly children—who desperately need help. They are not responsible for the country's political crisis. They should not have to suffer because of it.

Mr. President, there has been a proliferation of facilities in Haiti which must care not only for a vast number of orphans but also for an increasing number of abandoned and neglected children. The capital city, Port-au-Prince, has seventy orphanages—all of these which are run by only one relief organization, Christian Relief Services (CRS). There are many other orphanages throughout the entire country which take care of thousands and thousands of orphaned and abandoned children in Haiti.

I have visited these facilities in Haiti and I can give you a first-hand account of the heart breaking stories. The flow of desperate children into these orphanages is constant and these institutions face an increasing challenge in accommodating all of these needy children. The sad part is that these many of these orphanages get no other means of support other than the food administered to them through CRS, which in turn receives its resources through AID.

Last year and again this year, I have worked with Senators COCHRAN and BUMPERS—the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee—to ensure we continue the emergency feeding programs in Haiti through the PL 480 Title feeding program. I thank Chairman COCHRAN and Senator BUMPERS for their assistance in funding this program last year and for doing so again in this year's bill.

Similarly, I have worked with Chairman MCCONNELL and Senator LEAHY to include up to \$250,000 to support a pilot program to assist Haitian children in orphanages. The objective behind the program is to find ways to help orphanages better organize and manage themselves to seek outside help for resources for these children. I thank the Chairman, and Senator LEAHY for funding this initiative last year and for doing so again in the pending bill.

Another very important assistance program that should be maintained, if

not expanded, is agricultural assistance programs. Agricultural production in Haiti is extremely low. In the long run, agricultural production is necessary if Haiti is to provide jobs and food for its population.

Haiti today imports two thirds of its food. Every day, thousands of Haitians leave rural areas where they are unable to provide for themselves, and flood into the cities which are unable to sustain the population pressures. In the long run, agricultural and rural development is crucial to the goal of providing jobs, income and food for Haiti's people.

To further develop the rural and agricultural sectors of Haiti, attention needs to be given to a decentralized development strategy. I believe that continued focus on non-governmental organizations is appropriate. In fact, current USAID funding for agriculture and environmental programs in Haiti is all administered through NGOs. I believe that we should be promoting regional development and that associations linking private sector interests with local government need to be established. One way to do this is to link our own successful foundations and institutions of higher education together with local Haitians interested in pursuing this goal.

Given the importance of developing and expanding sound agriculture and environment programs in Haiti, I intend to work with Chairman MCCONNELL and Senator LEAHY to ensure that at least 20% of our total assistance for Haiti be for the promotion of agriculture and environment programs in Haiti. It is my hope that they will accept this request in conference report language.

Mr. President, I cannot overestimate enough the need to continue assistance programs to Haiti through the NGO community. We want to help Haitians in terms of feeding programs, agriculture and environment programs, and other initiatives such as basic health and education.

Mr. President, as you can see from the specifics of my speech, I have given serious thought to our assistance policy toward Haiti. U.S. policy toward Haiti is complicated. As I said at the beginning of these remarks, establishing, developing and sustaining democracy in Haiti is an important national interest.

One thing is clear: The U.S. cannot do for Haiti what it will not do for itself. The Haitians first have to realize the need to solve their political crisis. They clearly have not yet hit rock bottom; maybe that's what it will take to create the political will to move forward. Unfortunately, I do not yet see the requisite political will and determination in Haiti.

In the meantime, we cannot just walk away from Haiti completely. We must find ways to help the Haitian people, primarily through NGOs—since the Haitian Government has proven itself to be incapable of providing for its own people.

There's a tough road ahead for Haiti. With this amendment, we are helping to set some realistic conditions whereby that country can succeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 3528 through 3534) en bloc were agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I heard the distinguish Senator from Kentucky say—and I know we have word of those who wish to speak. The Senator from Kentucky and I have been on the floor, as have other Senators, since early yesterday morning on this bill. We are within sight of land, and we would kind of like to get some things moving.

If people have a matter they wish to add to the debate, or a matter that they wish to say, or things that they feel the Senate should consider for this side of the aisle, I would strongly urge them to come to do that, because there will be the effort of the chairman and myself to wrap this bill up as soon as we can.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Vermont that as far as we are aware there are only three more amendments that may require a rollcall vote, and then we would be ready to go to final passage. So we can, indeed, see the light at the end of the tunnel.

AMENDMENT NO. 3500, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, while waiting for others, I note with regard to the North Korea McCain amendment that I stand behind no Member of this body in my respect for my friend from Arizona, and certainly I know no one who has followed the situation in North Korea closer than he has. I give him a great deal of weight for his insight. I understand his concerns. I share them. I suspect that most Senators do, especially as we watched the unbelievably irresponsible activity on the part of North Korea in their recent missile firing.

Unfortunately, this amendment would prevent the United States from fulfilling its obligations under the Korea nuclear reactor agreement. Maybe the Congress will make that decision to do that. Of course the Congress can. But I hope that Senators would think long and hard before we go down that road. This North Korea agreement is not perfect. There is no disagreement about that on this side of the aisle. There is also no disagreement about the behavior of the North Korean Government. It is reprehensible. At times it seems inexplicable. It is certainly the most irresponsible activity of any country on Earth today. They almost seem to want the United States to back out of this agreement.

But I think the questions we should ask, if I could have the attention of my

friend from Arizona, would be just these:

Does the Secretary of Defense support this amendment? Does the commander of our forces in Korea support the amendment? What do they think the level of danger between the United States and North Korea will be with this amendment?

I ask this because I share the frustration of the Senator from Arizona toward North Korea.

Mr. MCCAIN. First of all, I appreciate the efforts of the distinguished Chairman of the subcommittee who mentioned he has had five hearings on this issue. We obviously paid close attention to the Senator from Wyoming who now feels that the time has come to support this amendment. I believe that the commander of the forces in Korea, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, probably the national security adviser, and even the President, if he knows about the amendment, is probably in opposition.

I want to tell the Senator from Vermont this agreement was flawed from the beginning. I stood on the floor of the Senate and said it would fail. It was a bribe. It was kicking the can down the road. There was no inspections required. The reality is that North Korea, which is the most Orwellian, bizarre government in history, they have a ruler who is—well, he likes to kidnap Japanese movie actresses. We are supposed to trust the word of these people? And they just launched a missile—a two-stage missile—which every arms control expert in America will tell you that you don't build these kind of missiles unless they are armed with weapons of mass destruction.

This thing was wrong from the start, and everything that we have seen has proven that to be the case, including every major newspaper in America—the L.A. Times, the New York Times, the Washington Post, and, frankly, the former national security adviser, Mr. Brzezinski, and many others; Dr. Kissinger, and many others.

For each expert that the Senator from Vermont could present, I could give you one who is as well regarded, or more highly regarded, who feels that it is time that we at least demand that they stop building nuclear weapons.

I reply to the Senator from Vermont. The amendment simply says that we won't continue to pay them millions of dollars if they in return continue to try to build nuclear weapons, which is what the whole agreement was about, supposedly, to start with.

I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Senator for his answer, which is precisely what I anticipated. I am not suggesting experts are in opposition. I merely wanted, for purposes of debate, to have that.

He speaks of these Orwellian, bizarre people. I suspect it is giving the North Korean leadership the benefit of the doubt to call them Orwellian and bizarre. They are worse than that. We can't ignore what has happened there.

But we are not dealing with rationale people.

Had I been the one to write the agreement we have with them, I would like to think that I would have written it a lot differently than it is. But I also understand the concerns that countries like South Korea, Japan, and others have put a lot more money and a lot more effort into this agreement than the United States has.

I do not want to give the North Korean Government an excuse to make the situation we now have a lot worse.

We have done some things with this agreement. The North Korean nuclear facility at Yongbyon and Taechom have been frozen under the IAEA inspection. Virtually all of the spent fuel in the Yongbyon reactor has been safely canned under IAEA seals. Those are spelled forth.

At the same time, this is a country which I think both the Senator from Arizona and I would agree has the ability to make inspections. The ability to determine what they are doing is probably as difficult as any country in the world. What makes it worse, unlike some other countries where it is difficult to find out what they are doing, they are not countries with the potential nuclear power and potential nuclear weapons power.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

I withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum. I see the Senator from Arizona on the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, is it still the desire of the Senator from Vermont that—does Senator LEVIN still wish to speak on this?

Mr. LEAHY. I wonder if the Senator from Arizona and the distinguished chairman would mind if we put in a quorum call for 2 minutes. If at that time we do not hear from the Senator, I will not do anything to delay this further.

Mr. MCCONNELL. And then there will be no objection to lifting it later?

Mr. LEAHY. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if I may, I wish to make another comment or so on this amendment.

I understand the notion that you want to make this thing work, and we have tried for quite a long time. It just seems to me that around the world right now in a number of places we are having these kinds of countries with the dictators sort of testing the United States, saying, "You have told us certain things, we have made certain agreements, but we are not going to keep them, and what are you going to do about it?"

I feel as if that is an increasing tendency around the world, and this is one of them, as well as Iraq and some other places. So I think we want to continue to work, we would like to have the

KEDO agreement, we would like to go ahead with the light-water reactor to avoid the nuclear development in North Korea, but that is the deal. And if that isn't being adhered to, then I think you have to do something. I think we have to take a tougher position than we have in the past.

I just do not see that it is good for the United States in the future to be making agreements with these sorts of rogue countries, trying to make things better, going ahead and doing our part, and them not doing theirs. I think that is what this amendment is about. And what we are challenged with, frankly, is to say, "We have things that need to be done, we are willing to work with you, but you have to keep up your part of the bargain." I think that is what this is all about.

I yield the floor.

By the way, if I may take that back, I was also listening to Senator DODD's proposal that has to do with things in Central America that have been kept secret, and I am very much interested in part of that myself, the Sister Ortiz thing that really needs to be declassified, in my judgment. So I just wanted to comment that I speak in support of the Dodd amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to table the McCain amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the McCain amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. KEMPTHORNE), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would vote "no."

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 80, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 257 Leg.]

YEAS—11

Akaka	Daschle	Levin
Biden	Kerrey	Lieberman
Chafee	Kohl	Wellstone
Cleland	Leahy	

NAYS—80

Abraham	Ford	Mikulski
Allard	Frist	Moseley-Braun
Ashcroft	Gorton	Moynihan
Baucus	Graham	Murray
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grams	Reed
Boxer	Grassley	Reid
Breaux	Gregg	Robb
Bryan	Hagel	Roberts
Bumpers	Harkin	Rockefeller
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Byrd	Hollings	Santorum
Campbell	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Coats	Hutchison	Sessions
Cochran	Inhofe	Shelby
Collins	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Conrad	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Craig	Kennedy	Snowe
D'Amato	Kerry	Specter
DeWine	Kyl	Stevens
Dodd	Landrieu	Thomas
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Thompson
Durbin	Lott	Thurmond
Enzi	Lugar	Torricelli
Faircloth	Mack	Warner
Feingold	McCain	Wyden
Feinstein	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—9

Bingaman	Domenici	Inouye
Brownback	Glenn	Kemphorne
Coverdell	Helms	Murkowski

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 3500), as further modified, was rejected.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I voted to table the McCain amendment because I believe it undermines the agreement we have in place with North Korea that is designed to denuclearize North Korea. This could effectively give North Korea an excuse to produce plutonium that it could use for nuclear weapons, which would be absolutely contrary to our most basic national security interests.

The McCain amendment would add a requirement for a certification relative to North Korea that would undermine the Agreed Framework that has frozen North Korea's nuclear weapons plutonium production program, because it would change the terms of that agreement. Before any of the fiscal year 1999 funds for implementation of that Agreed Framework could be spent, the McCain amendment would require the President to certify that North Korea is essentially denuclearized, which is not yet the case but which is the very goal of the Agreed Framework.

The Agreed Framework stipulates that North Korea must freeze its plutonium production facilities, namely three graphite-moderated nuclear reactors (either operating or under construction) and a plutonium reprocessing facility, in exchange for an international consortium (the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization, or KEDO) providing two proliferation-resistant light water nuclear power reactors.

Before the U.S. delivers key nuclear components to the North Korean light-water reactor program, North Korea must come into full compliance with its nuclear safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) under the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). It was understood from the outset that it would take a number of years, and probably

not before the year 2003, before North Korea would come into full compliance with its obligations under the NPT.

The whole idea of the Agreed Framework was in fact to bring North Korea into full compliance with the NPT and to go beyond the NPT's requirements by requiring North Korea to freeze and then dismantle its plutonium production facilities, and to place all its spent nuclear fuel in canisters safeguarded and monitored by the IAEA and eventually remove that spent fuel from North Korea. These represent significant security gains for the United States and we should honor our commitments under the agreement to realize these gains.

We should not give North Korea an excuse to walk away from its obligations under the Agreed Framework and to resume the production of plutonium for nuclear weapons. I believe that is what the McCain amendment would do, and that is why I voted to table the McCain amendment.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3526

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, is the Senator from Kentucky correct that the pending amendment is the Hutchison amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. It is my understanding Senator HUTCHISON may want to modify her amendment.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I would like to offer a modification to my amendment that will be argued and offered by Senator COATS from Indiana. It is acceptable to me as a modification of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify the amendment.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. There is apparently some question about clearing this amendment, which we believe is not objectionable to anybody. But I have just been informed it is cleared. I would like to—

Mr. LEAHY. I tell the Senator from Indiana he is correct on that.

Mr. COATS. I thank the Senator.

I would like a brief amount of time in which to explain what the modification is, because it is relevant to the action that was just taken by the Senate and I think important and determinative perhaps of action that will be taken subsequent to the disposition of this bill by the Senate in the conference. I am willing to do that at whatever time is appropriate. I know the majority leader is here, and I defer to him on that or to any other business that the—

Mr. MCCONNELL. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. COATS. Yes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The majority leader would like to make a few comments, if you would just withhold.

Mr. COATS. I would be more than pleased to.

Mr. LOTT. I know other Senators may want to speak briefly also on this subject.

SENATOR STROM THURMOND  
CASTS HIS 15,000TH VOTE

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I speak, I am sure, for the entire Senate in extending congratulations to Senator THURMOND, a great Senator from South Carolina, for having just cast his 15,000th vote in this Chamber.

An occasion like this reminds us of the continuity and the stability which the framers of the Constitution sought to establish in the Senate. I am sure that they had Senator STROM THURMOND in mind when they sought that. In the person of Senator THURMOND their intent was most notably fulfilled.

I am sure that if our distinguished President pro tempore were to ask which of those 15,000 votes he considers his most important, he would probably respond, even though I am sure he was proud of the vote he just cast, that the most important one is the next vote, for STROM always looks ahead.

Today, we join him in looking ahead, not recounting the tremendous record that he sets with this vote and all the votes of the past but, rather, counting on his future votes for what is good and right for the country he has served so long.

Madam President, this is a milestone. This is a magnificent gentleman who brings tremendous credit to his constituency, his State, to the U.S. Senate, and to America. I am very proud to call him a colleague and to commend him for this 15,000th vote he has just cast.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I join my colleagues in congratulating today the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

With the previous vote, Senator THURMOND joins the extraordinary Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, as one of only two U.S. Senators in the history of our Nation to cast 15,000 votes in this institution.

People outside of the Senate may not understand how astounding an achievement that is.

Let me put it this way: If this were baseball, Senator THURMOND and Senator BYRD would be Mark McGwire and Cal Ripken rolled into one. It is unlikely any of us will ever see their likes again.

But this is not baseball.

This is something even more fundamental to who we are as Americans.

This is the United States Senate. This is the place where we make the laws for a nation dedicated to the rule of law.

To serve here is a great honor—and an even greater responsibility.

In his 45 years in this body, Senator THURMOND has fought passionately to fulfill that responsibility as he has understood it. His tenacity and dedication to the causes in which he believes are legendary.

He fought for 20 years to require warning labels on alcohol. In 1988, thanks to Senator THURMOND's unwavering leadership, the Senate finally voted to do just that.

Five years later, in a tragic irony, Senator THURMOND's family experienced the kind of agony known to too many American families.

His beloved daughter Nancy was lost, killed by a drunk driver. She was only 22.

Nothing can heal the pain of losing someone so dear.

But I hope that this distinguished Senator takes some comfort in knowing that, thanks to his tenacity, perhaps another father, somewhere in America, will tuck his own little girl safely into bed tonight, instead of mourning her too-early death at the hands of a drunk driver.

Senator THURMOND truly is an institution within an institution.

His long and distinguished career is remarkable for its many successes—both in and out of the Senate.

In addition to being the longest-serving U.S. Senator in history, he has also served as a senator in the South Carolina State legislature and as Governor of that great State.

He has been a senior member of both the Democratic and Republican parties and the Presidential candidate of a third party. How many more people can say that in this country?

He volunteered for service in World War II and, on June 5, 1945, at the age of 43, took part in the first drop of the D-Day invasion—the air drop of American troops on Normandy Beach.

I am told that Senator THURMOND wanted to parachute onto Normandy Beach. But another officer—who clearly did not know who he was dealing with—decided Senator THURMOND was too old to jump out of an airplane. So he piloted a glider instead, landing, with the rest of his company, behind enemy lines.

Senator THURMOND is today a retired major general in the Army reserves.

He is also a member of the South Carolina Hall of Fame, and a recipient of more honors and awards than any of us can name, including the prestigious Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Years from now, when we look back on this summer, millions of Americans will tell their grandchildren what it was like to watch Mark McGwire and Sammy Sosa chase Roger Maris' home run record.

If I am lucky enough to have grandchildren, I will tell them about a milestone that was reached this summer for a second time, another record that people thought would remain forever unchallenged—15,000 votes in the U.S. Senate.

And I will tell them, "I was there. I got to work with both of those men. And they were truly amazing."